

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1 and 12, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at page 30-32.

No new matter has been introduced. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Abstract of the specification was objected to. Applicants submit an amended abstract with this paper.

### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, §102(e) AND §103(a)**

Claims 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 1-14 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,349,303 to Saito et al. (hereinafter, merely "Saito").

Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Saito in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,356 to Suzuki, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Suzuki”).

### III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 11 do not contain the phrase “or the like”. Therefore, withdrawal of rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is requested.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A network-information-processing system comprising:

... wherein when multiple information-processing apparatus apparatuses are within the network-information-processing system, one information-processing apparatus becomes a clerk for administrating the network-information-processing system by opening a control function for the information-creating apparatus,

where the GUI function of the information-processing apparatus that becomes the clerk displays face of attendees, IP address, icons of at least the information-processing apparatus and information-creating apparatus, and connections between the information-processing apparatus and information-creating apparatus.” (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Saito relates to creating the minutes of a conference that are in line with the flow of the conference. When the minutes of a teleconference are created automatically, it is possible to create minutes that clearly indicate in which conference room statements were made and images were generated as well as the order in which these events occurred. As understood by Applicants, Suzuki relates to a multimedia information audiovisual

apparatus which can suitably add mark information to streaming media and manage it and enables a user to see and listen to a presentation effectively.

Applicants respectfully submit Saito and Suzuki, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, nothing in Saito and Suzuki is found that teaches wherein when multiple information-processing apparatus apparatuses are within the network-information-processing system, one information-processing apparatus becomes a clerk for administrating the network-information-processing system by opening a control function for the information-creating apparatus and where the GUI function of the information-processing apparatus that becomes the clerk displays face of attendees, IP address, icons of at least the information-processing apparatus and information-creating apparatus, and connections between the information-processing apparatus and information-creating apparatus, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claim 12 is also patentable.

#### IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent on an independent claim discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800